Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VII, No. 23, *Issue Number* 332, JUNE 7, 1950 *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

ON COLD WAR

by Bonner Fellers

Secretary Dean Acheson's unveiling of his "balanced collective defense" plan, last week, ushers in a new phase of European military aid. In spite of Mr. Acheson's suave peace reassurances the cold war is assuming many characteristics of a hot war, including actual shooting. The Iron Curtain is the line of battle. On either side contending Powers amass military might. Red forces claim readiness to resist attack. The Administration insists that the presence of our weapons will lift European morale and deter aggression. As the cold war moves unswervingly toward deeper American involvement, it is time to examine its symptoms in the hope of finding a cure.

Possibly our greatest authority on the philosophy of war is the Prussian General, Karl von Clausewitz. His three volumes, On War, completed in 1827, have long been the infallible guide for professional soldiers the world over. Von Clausewitz' maxim, "The war of a community -- of whole nations -- is a political act . . . the political view is the object, war is the means", is well known, but it is not -- at least in the United States -- as well heeded as it should be.

Our leaders have failed to realize that the old Prussian master was not a mere worshipper of force at all costs. He stressed two indispensable spiritual values in war -- "an intellect" possessing "traces of inner light, which lead to the truth, and then the courage to follow this faint light". Finally, his observations have particular pertinence to our present cold war, and his warnings, if heeded, might yet prevent the cold war from developing into a real hot war.

II

Our interminable cold war with Russia closely reflects von Clausewitz' doctrine: "as one side dictates the law to the other, there arises a sort of reciprocal action, which logically must lead to an extreme. This is the first reciprocal action."

Early in the cold war Russia "dictated the law": we reacted by endeavoring to parry her blows. Stalin threatened Western Europe with Communist domination; we responded with the Marshall Plan -- a multi-billion dollar program. Our Allies feared the Red Army; we reacted with a Military Assistance Program -- our second multi-billion dollar venture. This assistance constituted our "first reciprocal action".

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The passage of these programs set up in Russia what von Clausewitz calls "a second reciprocal action . . . As long as the enemy is not defeated, he may defeat me", and "dictate the law to me as I did to him".

Russia responded by:

1. Amassing military might in West Poland;
2. Increasing and strengthening her Baltic installations;
3. Converting 40 per cent of her industry to tanks;
4. Shooting down an American plane over the Baltic.

These Russian measures constituted the "second reciprocal action".

It might be said that a reading of von Clausewitz would have foreshadowed America's next move to meet Russia's military gesture. "But . . . the adversary does the same; therefore, there is a new mutual enhancement, which, in pure conception, must create a fresh effort towards an extreme. This is the third case of reciprocal action . . ."

Specifically, the United States moved to:

1. Step up our Air Force appropriation by $350 million;
2. Call for a two-year extension of the draft;
3. Dispatch B-29's to England; suggest -- A-bombs for Allies;
4. Promise increased European aid.

It is obvious that Russia is forcing our hand. Many observers have been uneasily recognizing that something is wrong with our strategy. In the New York Times (June 1), Cyrus Sulzberger writes that American moves "represent, to a large degree, reflex action to Kremlin probing in the various geographical areas". Now, von Clausewitz says: "War is a political act . . . the political view is the object, war is the means."

What is the political object? It is officially to save Europe. But from a purely military view, Soviet Russia's force, poised on the edge of Western Europe, is insuperable. It is well known that her 200 divisions could sweep to the Pyrenees in less than 60 days. In short, Stalin has won a round in the battle of cold strategy. In the words of von Clausewitz he has chosen the "time and place" we are to fight.

Moreover, recognition of this state of affairs has had a highly negative effect on war-weary Western European peoples. They not only realize the futility of ground forces holding their frontier, they also have grasped the fact that actually there is no frontier to hold -- that the vast blue dome of the sky above is Europe's only frontier so long as Stalin's 16,000 combat planes can operate unchallenged. Accordingly, a desperate hope persists that American Air Force units, capable of neutralizing the Red Air Force, may be based in Europe. An abiding fear haunts our European Allies that unless this is done, during peace, Russia would be able to terrorize Western European Powers into neutrality! With the Atomic bomb as a threat, Stalin could issue an ultimatum

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that if our Allies refuse to be neutral, he will take out their cities as his first act of war.

Since our war objective is to save Western Europe, how can we ask our Allies to fight, if fighting means certain and immediate destruction? In short, Stalin has put us in an untenable position.

III

This position looms even worse, as we view the picture through the lenses of a "politico-military" expert like von Clausewitz. The enslaved Russian masses are restless under their own military occupation and a unifying agency is urgently needed. American tanks on the Rhine provide Stalin with a visible symbol, proving to his people that we are determined to destroy their "People's Republic". This is the very ingredient he needs to solidify his people.

Our faulty program is assisting Stalin in his determination to cause our economy to collapse. In spite of our economic resources and terrific war potential, the cost of the cold war is growing prohibitive because the decision to hold Western Europe's frontier is unsound in principle. No amount of lavish spending and flawless execution can compensate for this tragically faulty strategy.

Secretary Acheson, in his talk to Congress last week, does not spell it out when he says we and our partners "each take our respective share of the common burden", but his real message is -- we pay the bill.

Reliable estimates would place the total cost of the announced European military aid program at some $35 to $50 billion. European Powers are able to bear very little of this amount. At home our 1950 budget is already some $5 billion in the red, and other contemplated foreign aids have not yet begun. We are moving up to a $50 billion budget! Our cold war will eventually dislocate our economy.

Could this tempt us to start a hot war -- when we might not be militarily ready -- to stop this fantastic deficit spending once for all?

IV

But, we need not be maneuvered into hot war for we can win the cold one. To do this, however, we must have a clear, effective, over-all strategy. Our present obsolete, piecemeal strategy is of European origin. It reverts to World War I methods by planning to engage the full weight of the Red Army. It slights all fronts, except the European. It offers no assurance of success.

Our new strategy must be <u>New World</u> in concept. It must be one which is effective continuously. "Strategy", wrote von Clausewitz, "can never take its hand from the work for a moment." The new strategy must view Russia as an entity; it must promise success and provide effective

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressure when and where required. Its parts must further the basic strategy. It must reflect the spiritual quality and the genius of the American people.

Our decisive participation in two world wars and our leading role in this cold war gives us the right to dictate a New World strategy.

To implement our New World strategy for peace we must:

1. Keep cold war costs on a sound economic level by limiting foreign military aid; cutting present expenditures for our Army and Navy. Thus we would permit our national genius -- an expanding free economy -- to provide the real foundation for our whole effort.
2. Build without delay the best Air Force in the world, with, of course, adequate support by ground and naval forces. This, too, would reflect the productive genius and human resourcefulness of our people.
3. Improve intelligence agencies -- "the eyes of defense".
4. Insist that our Allies form a United States of Europe; help them to eliminate the threat of civil war. Our military aid should be limited to equipment essential for internal security forces -- in the hope of a paralysis of the fifth column.
5. Extend the Monroe Doctrine over South Korea, Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines -- a positive stand.
6. Foster friendship with strategic Moslem countries. Possibly Libya offers the closest air bases, which we initially could hold, to Russia's vulnerable areas.
7. Make peace treaties with Japan and Germany with or without Russian assent.

Finally, and most important of all, we must project the Truth through the Iron Curtain to put the Soviet Government on the defensive in its 30-year war against the Russian people. This transcends all other cold war measures. Our psychological campaign against Japan worked in time of war; it can be made to work against Russia in time of peace. Truth is our "inner light" which we must help the Russian people to see and understand.

This suggested strategy in no way contemplates abandonment of our European Allies. Rather, it is the only course which insures their survival if war comes. In American resourcefulness and genius for production -- which could enable us to gain mastery of the air -- rests our hope for peace and our insurance for victory should war come.

Returning to von Clausewitz -- "War does not spring up suddenly, it does not spread to the full in a moment." With sound strategy, there is yet time for us to achieve lasting peace.

Brigadier General Bonner Fellers (ret'd), West Point 1918, DSM with oak leaf cluster, was Military Observer with the British in Africa (1940-42) and on General MacArthur's staff as a Ground Officer (1943-46).

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 23

By Frank C. Hanighen June 7, 1950

SECRET DIPLOMACY: We have received confidential reports from London and Paris that Secretary Acheson during his recent visit to those capitals distributed promises which he would not dare to disclose to Members of Congress. According to these advices, Acheson pledged a full continuation of ECA -- in some form or other -- after the Marshall Plan expires in 1952. Checking on these reports, we find some officials in Washington confirming them, and with wry faces. These officials, while privately in sympathy with prolongation of ECA, have tried to keep our high directors of policy from giving such assurances to the Western European governments. They have argued that, if those governments were to feel uncertain of future aid, they would be more inclined to bring about economic reforms, effect economies in government and abolish barriers to free flow of trade -- in short, to lift themselves to full recovery by their own initiative. Now, say these officials bitterly, Acheson has spoiled this strategy.

But the more sensational news from our Paris and London sources is that Acheson promised to pool our resources and integrate our entire economy with the economies of Britain and France and other Western European nations. At least, according to our information, this is what officials in Paris and London believe that Acheson promised. This intelligence confirms the suspicions of Senator Jenner who, in an impassioned speech on May 19, stated his belief that Acheson had so committed us. "I think", said Jenner (Congressional Record, May 19, pp. 7424-25), "every step our Government is taking is a deliberate attempt to do the very thing that they are about to accomplish, which is to create a world semi-super-state, destroy the national sovereignty of our country, and let our interests, both economic and defense, be tied to the interest of the rest of the world . . . if this is the direction in which we have been maneuvered . . . , it amounts to traffic in treason."

* * * * *

TYDINGS-ISM AND SMITH-ISM: Tydings-ism moved into a new and less heroic phase during the past week -- with a Presidential panel in the offing designed to take the burden from the sloping shoulders of the Maryland Senator. Any such body will, of course, inherit the popular suspicion so arduously won by the Senate sub-committee and its chairman. The old clamor -- "Oh! let's have something like a Royal Commission" -- sounds a bit girlish in the present ferocious situation. And, it should be remembered, Tydings has to run for re-election in Maryland -- that is, for Senator, not for the Ambassadorship to Britain, as some ill-mannered folk have claimed.

The little romp by Senator Margaret Chase Smith and six other Senators, listed as Republicans in the Congressional Directory, has left some of the participants somewhat breathless. Senator Thye, for instance, chimed in with Senator M. G. Smith that day, but two days later -- did he hear from home? -- seemed to have second thoughts, judging by a statement he made which inspired a forensic smile from Senator McCarthy. As for Senator Ives, another of the "six", he went up to the convention of Young Republicans in Wingdale, New York, to teach the youth how to grow up to be like Arthur Vandenberg. But the kids were refractory, and passed a resolution approving "the action instituted by Senator McCarthy and the spirit in which it was brought." Two days later, doubtless after a reflective train ride back to Washington and a perusal of his mail, Ives made the astonishing discovery that there is, as he put it, "accumulating evidence that the Administration is trying to whitewash the State Department". Well, well.

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finally, we come -- as gallantly as we can -- to the case of the handsome lady Senator from Maine, who started last week's rumpus. Wind-swept by praise from her favorite Fair Deal columnists, the Senator flew off yesterday to attend a meeting of UNESCO in Italy. Some weeks ago, we expressed the opinion that "with very little effort the lady Senator could qualify as a 100 per cent Fair Dealer", and reported how zealously the Administration was wooing her. Oddly enough, no one has connected the wooing, and the subsequent gracious appointment of the lady to UNESCO (not to mention the pleasant junket to Italy), with that "noble" (as one emotional commentator described it) speech in which Senator Smith was so adeptly "neutral against" McCarthy. Onward to the bipartisan State!

* * * * *

ACHESON AND CONGRESS: (Edna Lonigan, our correspondent on Capitol Hill, analyzes the show staged by the Secretary of State.) It was no mere coincidence that the rise of representative government paralleled the spread of accounting. The limitation of Power through control of the Purse is a sober unglamorous business, possible only where costs and results are measurable with a great precision. It is not an accident that the architects of absolute power have everywhere substituted the spectacle for the factual report. Hitler's circuses were meant to divert the minds of the people from what -- among other things -- he was doing with deficit financing. The television cabinet meeting in Chicago recently was an abortive experiment in mass psychology. But Secretary Acheson's talk to Congress on the Atlantic Conference was more successful in diverting press and public.

The proper presentation of policy recommendations meant for legislative scrutiny is in writing. Like chartered accounting, the documents of our great Secretaries of State were designed to increase precision, to help analysis by Congress, the agent of the sovereign people. It was the policy, not the man, which was persuasive. One cannot imagine Elihu Root or Charles Evans Hughes going before Congress to charm the Members into accepting the Open Door policy.

The latest spectacle likewise bore no resemblance to historic British Cabinet procedures, as its apologists implied. The British system rests on legislative supremacy. The Cabinet is an integral part of Parliament. The Members are questioning their agents, whom they can vote out of office. Acheson's statement was for the opposite purpose. Its delivery was dignified. That is what the script called for. But it contained no marshalling of facts, no clear analysis of the problem and the alternatives. This manner of presentation was no oversight. It exemplified the "new politics" of Executive absolutism. All important decisions are to be left to the Executive arm. Congress is to be given only enough generalizations to induce it to sign the blank check.

There is no excuse for Congress' betrayal of representative government in leaving its own chambers and fitting itself to a place and time selected by government employees. When George Washington offered to come to Congress to explain his foreign policy Congress gave an emphatic No. Many Members stayed away from the Acheson meeting, but none has yet introduced a vote of censure for those colleagues who responded to the invitation. The present Congress is passing judgment on the separate pieces of the many-sided attempt to set up a super-government of unlimited powers through defense, foreign policy and domestic issues. If it surrenders its legislative scrutiny at this moment, the results will be far-reaching indeed.

* * * * *

JOB HOLDERS' LOBBY: (Miss Lonigan discovered the following interesting example of the bureaucracy's activities.) The Budget Bureau has put on official record the doctrine that government exists for the benefit of office-holders. Reorganiza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion Plan No. 17 provided for the transfer of two wartime housing agencies (scheduled to expire next fall) to Housing and Home Finance, where, Senators suspected, they would become permanent.

In defense of the transfer the Budget Bureau complained that keeping the programs under General Services Administration (where they have been) meant "the staff . . . will have no place to go" in October. Naturally it never occurred to the Budget Bureau that these staff members could go to local governments, or teaching or private business. "The result", said the Bureau, "will be an exacerbation of that sense of isolation and insecurity which lack of identification with the central mission of GSA has already produced." Translated, this means the workers could not bear to work for an agency which was trying to cut expenses. But here is the gem. "It must also be expected that as long as the CFS [Community Facilities Service -- one of those agencies] continues to exist as a part of GSA, it will be driven to agitate for new public works or engineering assignments as a means of self-preservation." (By the way, this is illegal lobbying.) The Budget Bureau solemnly recommended "the transfer of personnel who have been working so hard to get new construction programs for FWA [Federal Works Administration] and GSA to agencies where they can apply their skills to a continuing and tangible major purpose. . . . Failure to transfer advance planning functions will assure the continued existence of a focal point of agitation." Senator Cain tried to get a disavowal of the language, but in vain.

* * * * *

POST OFFICE: The office of HUMAN EVENTS has been in a state of acute anger for the past week, since our mail deliveries have been cut to one per day. Since we cannot comment on this matter dispassionately, we prefer to leave it to Congressman Ralph Gwinn of New York. He has the story correctly in his release to constituents. "The Post Office, the perfect case the Socialists always cite to prove that Socialism is better than free enterprise, has come a-cropper", says Mr. Gwinn, with what we consider admirable restraint. "Though it has a government monopoly, it can't pay expenses. The loss for 1949 was more than a half billion dollars. Politicians do like to raise the price of the services they 'give away', so they wanted to let the taxpayers pay the difference.

"Congress thought otherwise. Congress said, 'Improve your methods, cut costs. Put in machinery and cut down the losses.' The House reduced the budget the Post Office asked for by only one per cent. But immediately the Post Office politicians retaliated by reducing services, reducing deliveries, delaying mails, delaying business and throwing thousands of men out of jobs. . . . This, in Mr. Truman's 'most prosperous period of all time'. Here we have the old game of squeezing the people, to make them bring pressure on Congress to pay the losses. The Postmaster General even instructed all the Postmasters across the country to 'give wide publicity to the readjustments provided for in this order'. Time is short. Congress must be made to jump through the hoops by violent protests of the public."

Mr. Gwinn goes on to explain: "A big part of the loss is incurred through carrying mail for the Government. It gets free postage to the value of $149 million, according to Postmaster General Donaldson. The Government propaganda for Social Security, Public Housing, Socialized Medicine, the Brannan Plan, and all the rest, is carried by trains and planes and on the backs of mail carriers free -- at taxpayers' expense. The cutting down of the service to the public will not disturb the free service to the Government agencies. That will go on unimpaired. It is interesting to note that all Members of Congress, both Republican and Democratic, in both Houses, spend only $1.2 million on franked mail against the Executive's $149 million. Those whose aim is secretly to attack Congress complain about the Congressmen's franking privilege. In fact, Congressmen spend only 1 cent for every $3.00 the Administration spends on postage alone."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Christianity and History, by H. Butterfield, M.A. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.75. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

These lectures appear to have made a great stir in the learned world of England after they were repeated by Professor Butterfield in a series of weekly broadcasts. The attention and excitement aroused by them emphasizes the prevalent revolt against the methods established by Ranke and his followers which have pretty well dominated the historical scholarship of the Twentieth Century. Earlier and much milder symptoms of the revolt could be discerned in an essay published some years ago by Professor Trevelyan in defense of the old-fashioned literary historians, who, whatever their technical deficiencies, brought to their work the quality of imagination that Professor Butterfield now asserts to be necessary to all historical interpretation. The current indictment against the scientific method is that it tends to trespass its proper boundaries and by excessive claims to authority to establish an illusion of "definiteness and finality". Thus it encourages a kind of self-assured rigidity of mind which applied in such fields as journalism and politics has been productive of disaster.

The true work of the imagination in the interpretation of history, Professor Butterfield tells us, is "prophetic" in the scriptural sense. That is to say, we find in history the confirmation of truths which are also discoverable by profound subjective experience. One of these truths is the ubiquity of sin. To ignore it is to fall prey to dangerous and deadly fallacies, of which the chief in our age has been the illusion of progress, or the notion that human nature is susceptible of infinite improvement and that it is possible to produce on this earth a state of affairs in which all men will be happy and good. One of the great advantages possessed by the Marxists in the present ideological conflict is their recognition of the unalterable fact of human wickedness and the use made of it in their historical exegesis. But our political idealists, nurtured in the concept of progress, yet confronted as they have been in our century with the unmistakeable reality of evil, have explained it away by the invention of monsters; that is, of extra-human individuals or classes or races to which all the responsibility for all the evil can be ascribed. Thus they have fallen into the further fallacy of localizing a guilt that is really universal and thus exists also within themselves. This division of a badly spotted mankind into white and black finds its natural corollary in the phenomenon of total warfare, pursued, not for concrete objectives, but for abstractions such as Christian civilization or the Four Freedoms or the Classless Society.

If history testifies to the truth of the Christian concept of human nature, it testifies also to the principle of divine justice in human affairs. Thus the present unhappy state of the world may be seen as a form of providential judgment upon the self-righteous illusions of the victors of the recent war, and their failure to recognize the guilt that resided in themselves no less than in their enemies. In the coming revision of history, Professor Butterfield assures us, little moral difference will be discerned between the proponents of the Munich Pact and their adversaries. In any case historical judgments cannot be rendered against individuals, since historical guilt is invariably compounded of a multitude of small and obscure guilts. The historian's judgments can be passed only against systems, and it is this factor of human pride and self-righteousness that causes all systems to perish. It is the folly of each generation to become preoccupied with some facet of human experience and to exaggerate it until it seems to constitute the whole of reality. Thus historical traps are created from which humanity in some cases can be extricated only by providential catastrophe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 23

RECEIVED JUN 15 1950

By Marion Dönhoff HAMBURG -- June, 1950

SPAIN: Travelling in today's Spain does reveal many surprises to a German who has had plenty of experience of authoritarian regimes. I recently journeyed through this "closed" country for four weeks, and, speaking frankly, everything was quite different from what I had expected it to be.

One has got so used to dividing the world into two alternatives -- East and West, modern and reactionary, democratic and Fascist -- that one scarcely would think it possible to find situations which are neither the one nor the other. Spain in any case is not what one had thought it to be. On the other hand it is not by a long way what one would not have thought it to be. It is always and in all respects "different".

Spain is certainly not European, but it is also not pure "Orient" as one would have thought at first glance. It is certainly not democratic but it is also not totalitarian. The Spaniards are possibly more individualistic than other people. They are governed authoritatively, but not by a dictator alone or by the Roman Catholic Church, but by both together. There exists a peculiar functional system between the two and they are only able to exist together. Without Franco the Church would gradually be deprived of its influence by the liberal longings of the intelligentsia; whereas Franco without the Church would have no proper basis for his regime.

Nothing reminds one of the Hitler regime: the latter's parades, compulsory instruction, organizations and meetings. One does not see party uniforms, and the emblem of the Falange I have noticed only at headquarters in a few big towns.

The fundamental difference between the Hitler and the Franco regime is obviously the fact that with the Nazis the demands of the State affected every single citizen. From the "pimpf" groups into which the ten-year-olds were enrolled, until the last breath of old age, the minutest detail of private life was organized. The farmers were organized in their villages and the intellectuals in the Reich's Chamber of Culture -- the ant State was the example for the whole system. In Spain things are entirely different. There, only the framework is, so to speak, authoritatively fixed; within this everyone can do or not do what he likes. That, of course, is less painful and far more sensible, especially as the simple folk do not notice the framework, and thus take no exception to it. For the intellectuals, however, matters are different; for them the narrow framework is painfully noticeable.

In the main there are two things which determine the framework: (1) The very strict press censorship and the ban on any public criticism; (2) the strict regimen of the Church. In all cultural affairs -- plays, films, book publication and school and university curriculae -- the Church has a decisive voice. Obviously Sartre plays may not be produced and Descartes may not be read at the universities. Even less spiritual matters are subject to the influence of the Church -- two-piece bathing dresses, for instance, are strictly banned!

Nevertheless, a man like Ortega y Gasset has voluntarily returned from exile after 15 years, because -- as he says -- there is only one possibility of exerting an influence in this modern world; that is, personally, unofficially. And for this the difficulties, or possibilities as the case may be, are the same everywhere.

All Spaniards have not yet got over the shock of the incredibly cruel civil war which caused casualties of two millions out of the 24 million inhabitants. Only those who know the history of Spain of the last 150 years will understand why the

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spaniards regard the present system which has given them peace and order as a deliverance in spite of all its drawbacks. Peoples which have suffered the chaos of civil war and collapse and the to-and-fro drifting of homeless refugees are inclined to value security more than anything else. When they have the choice between freedom and security they will not à tout prix choose freedom, but as a start will choose security.

The indifferent, even those who do not sympathize with the regime, in fact everyone with the exception of the active opponents, see in the Franco regime the only guarantee of peace and order, although the discrepancy between rich and poor is unbelievable and the economic difficulties disastrous. Little wonder, for Franco had to start from scratch after the civil war, because the Reds had removed the entire gold reserve. Today Spain is the only needy European country which does not share in Marshall aid. In view of this policy of boycott it is only due to the Franco regime that Communism has not yet broken out in Spain.

To many people in all walks of life, I put the question of what would be the results of free democratic elections in Spain -- how many Franco adherents, monarchists and Communists are there? No one could, or would, give a clear cut answer to this question, but they are all agreed on one thing: there are 30 to 40 per cent "potential" Communists who would become active Communists as soon as propaganda was freed. And what Communism would mean in Spain where Bakunin, the propagator of anarchism, is the shining example of the Left Wing, only those can realize who known Spanish history and the Spaniards.

The wish of the Americans to democratize the Franco regime could be disastrous for the whole Western world, because if Spain should turn Communist the whole structure of the Atlantic Pact would have been built in vain. There seems little sense in spending billions of dollars to make Europe safe against Communism if this vital corner of Europe is driven into the arms of Communism merely because, for reasons of democratic etiquette, one is afraid of soiling the white waistcoat.

* * *

THE GERMAN EASTERN REPUBLIC CHANGES ITS POLICY: When the German Eastern State was founded in September, 1949, the Communist (SED) Government for months tried by every means to attract the "brothers in the West". Nothing was too much trouble, the propaganda machine was running at full speed and all sorts of lies were used to demonstrate the unity.

By now the Eastern Government seems to have realized that the Bonn Government can have no understanding with the Communists in the Eastern zone. Just now the drawing up of combined "lists of candidates of the National Front" for the elections in October has been decided upon. The bourgeois parties: the CDU (Christian-Democratic Union) and the LDP (Liberal-Democratic Party) -- on whose pseudo-existence some store had been put -- have thus capitulated and accepted the uniform list of candidates.

It has, therefore, become clear that the German Eastern State will go the way of the "peoples' democracies". The effort to steer a moderate course in order to render the propaganda for a united Germany more plausible and to leave the door open for an "Anschluss" of the "misguided Western brothers" has now been dropped.

The recently published draft of a resolution for the coming party rally shows the sinister determination to suppress all forces which do not fit into the scheme of a "people's democracy". The SED will assist the "progressive clergy" against the "reactionary actions of certain Church dignitaries". It must act "against the strong position of the big farmers", it must not permit "class distinctions to become blurred" and must fight against the "cosmopolitanism and objectivism" of the universities. The complete line-up of the Eastern zone with Soviet Russia apparently can no longer be avoided.

* * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MILITARISM IN GERMANY? Of all the arguments, which the leader of the Socialist Party, Dr. Schumacher, brought forward at the party rally in Hamburg to support his negative attitude towards Strasbourg, there is only one which will carry any weight outside the party: the fear that entry into the European Council will automatically lead to entry into the Atlantic Pact, and that thereby Germany would lose the possibility of sticking to its decision against rearmament. The majority of the Germans, especially the young Germans, have definitely had enough of militarism.

A Swiss student recently told me he did not believe this. He gave his opinion: if this were true why had the book on General Rommel made such a fascinating impression on the Germans? And why -- he asked -- had Zuckmayer's play, "The Devil's General", which had stirred up such a lot of discussion at the time, been the biggest stage hit in Germany since 1945?

The question is useful because it serves to clear up a very important problem. The matter at issue is not that the Germans get excited by this play or that book as by a dream which they hope might one day come true. The truth is rather that they somehow or other want to find a moral vindication of their past. Again and again they have been told, in connection with the Nuremberg trials and the internment camps, that all German soldiers were criminals. For years no young officer who had been on the General Staff could find a job, because no one dared engage a man who had been branded as a "militarist". Many who could find no livelihood went to the Eastern zone in desperation and joined the Eastern police.

The normal German soldier who had committed no war crimes -- and that was by far the greater part of them -- reacted with a deep resentment: Why are we, who have for years done our duty, branded as criminals, and why are those on the other side, who have done exactly the same, praised as heroes?

And then one day the play, "The Devil's General", appeared on the stage, and many found the justification for their actions in the picture of the famous Air General Udet, who was an unruly, dashing chap and feared neither death nor Hitler. Always he had told the riskiest political jokes, despised the Nazis and never made a secret of it, but he had kept his oath as a soldier sacred, until -- too late -- he realized all and committed suicide. This play was no fiction, but simply Udet's life history. And everyone realized: Yes, that's how it was, and really I have not acted any differently. Then Brigadier Young's book on Rommel was published, and he described Rommel as a chivalrous German officer, as an incredibly gifted general, a courageous soldier sans peur et sans raproche.

Mind you, an Englishman had admitted it: for the sick at heart that is balm which soothes. But it has nothing to do with militarism.

* * *

EXPERIMENTAL DEMOCRACY: A short while back a so-called mock parliament was held for the first time in Hamburg. The idea originated with the British who, in that way, wanted to popularize the practices of a democratic parliament. It obviously proved a success, for the Germans have taken it up again.

About 500 Hamburgers had assembled in the large auditorium of Hamburg University. They were not only spectators, but symbolized at the same time the members of the Federal Parliament. A few popular personalities on the platform acted as cabinet ministers. The role of minister president was played by a well-known journalist, and the opposition was represented by a gentleman in black, sitting on one side, who typified very much the Socialist parliamentarian of the Weimer times.

In the beginning we were all a bit shy as we were at boarding school when we staged a play by Shakespeare (because the parents knew quite well that we were not Portia or Juliet, but only their daughter). In the beginning one certainly did not know whether to prepare for a joke or whether it would be better to join seriously in the play, and the ministers on the platform did not know either!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But then it started, and all were soon passionately engaging in it. The foreign minister was asked questions regarding the introduction of the new national anthem, and he proposed that in the future we should sing not "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles" but "Deutschland, Deutschland unter anderen" (Not "Germany, Germany above all others", but "Germany, Germany among others"). The members of parliament, i.e., the public, among which were numerous students, debated exceedingly well, made quick and witty interjections, and the whole soon seemed more like an improvised cabaret than a parliamentary debate.

However, the speaker, obviously an expert in democratic schooling, managed to guide the show into more dignified ways, and the motion to join the European Council was presented by the minister president with really excellent arguments and great verve (the minister president by the way is the chairman of the local European Movement branch). The leader of the opposition rejected the motion, curiously using the same arguments which a week later Dr. Schumacher, the leader of the Socialists, used at his party rally in Hamburg.

The whole was a very odd mixture of seriousness and fun, which, however, in a very subtle way showed up the advantages of a democratic discussion. The best proof of the success can certainly be found in the fact that most of those present decided to turn up again at the next mock parliament.

* * *

UNREST IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN WESTERN GERMANY: The West German Communist Party has been in a state of alarm for a considerable time. It began in February, when Josef Schappe, the editor of the central news-sheet of the Communist Party Freies Volk (Free People) was thrown out of the party. He had refused to submit to Moscow's unconditional demand for supremacy and the party executive therefore declared him to be a Titoist. His wife, Wilma Schappe, likewise a functionary of the party, consequently received a request from the party that she should start divorce proceedings. When Mrs. Schappe refused to do so she was relieved of all her official functions in the party.

The crisis in the party continues. Schappe himself estimates that about 80 per cent of the members no longer approve of the attitude of the party executive. One simply does not wish to be a tool of Moscow any longer. In North Rhine-Westphalia alone the membership is said to have dropped from 130,000 to 52,000. Schappe has held various meetings, and the formation of a German Communist Party independent of Moscow is clearly discernible on the horizon.

At about the same time Leibrand, a member of the Federal Parliament and member of the party executive, gave up his seat in the Bonn Parliament, allegedly for private reasons. And on top of it all Kurt Müller, the vice-chairman of the party and also a member of the Federal Parliament, disappeared about the middle of May. The letter in which Müller informed the President of the Federal Parliament of his resignation was to everyone's astonishment not signed by Müller, but by means of a rubber facsimile stamp. Days later the Department of State Security announced from the Soviet Sector of Berlin that Müller and a friend of his, Mrs. Fischer, had been arrested in the Eastern zone -- incidentally, a most peculiar announcement because the names of persons arrested are never published in the Eastern zone. At the same time the executive of the Communist Party in the Western zones stated that the former vice-chairman had been excluded from the party because -- how could it be otherwise? -- he had been unmasked as an agent of a foreign Power and a Titoist! The Communist press, however, never at a loss to give its own interpretation of things, printed in extra-bold lettering: "The decision of the party executive concerning the exclusion of agent Müller, alias Kutschi, from the KPD, is a serious and heavy blow to the imperialistic warmongers and their West German minions".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED